DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 157 HE 001 028

By-Dyer, Henry S.
Research Between the Right and Left.
Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
Pub Date 30 Jan 69
Note-26p.; Paper presented at Workshop of the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, Durham, North Carolina, January 30, 1969.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
Descriptors-*College Environment, Community Attitudes, *Conflict, *Educational Change, *Institutional Research, Institutional Role, *Organization, Student Behavior

This paper explores 2 concepts, institutional research in higher education and what is called the Left-Right Continuum, and suggests that periods of conflict provide better opportunities for meaningful institutional research than when the campus is quiet. To ensure the health of a college, interinstitutional research and intrainstitutional research must go hand in hand. The Left-Right Continuum is a socio-cultural, multidimensional yardstick that measures segments from the extreme left (activists who revolt against all institutional authority) to the extreme right (people off campus who fear any form of change that may take place on campus). Between these 2 groups are students and faculty members (the undistributed middle) who are not concerned with politics or institutional changes but whose unrecognized needs, hopes, and frustrations are sources of possible conflict. The college itself is likened to the Freudian model of personality. The ego is a combination of faculty and administration, the id is the undistributed middle, and the superego is the charter of the college, which causes guilt about unrealized institutional goals; the college is in a constant state of neurosis. When the id, which is usually repressed by the ego, comes to the surface during a period of conflict, the institutional researcher is provided with the best view of the real internal dynamics of the institution for analysis, and can suggest the kind of adjustments that are necessary for the health of the college. (WM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED031157

Research Between the Right and Left*

Henry S. Dyer
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J.

This is the Age of the Great Gaps: the credibility gap, the gap between the have's and the have-not's, the educational opportunities gap, the gap between the Right and Left, the generation gap, the information gap, the communication gap, and so on. It is intriguing to suppose that there are interconnections among all these gaps, so that if you could really close any one or two of them, you might find that you had narrowed most of the rest. Much of what I shall be saying tonight will be concerned directly or indirectly with the role of institutional research in this narrowing process. But first I want to make sure that the communication gap between you and me is as narrow as possible by telling a story, which no doubt some of you are familiar with, but which I shall tell anyway just to make sure we are all starting in the same frame of reference.

It is about the preacher in the hills of West Virginia who thought he had solved the problem of communication between himself and his board of deacons. Whenever he wanted something for his church, he would bring up the matter in an off-hand way during the course of his Sunday sermon so as to establish a favorable climate of opinion. Then on the following Wednesday he would put the proposition directly to his board of deacons. This technique usually worked fine. Then the time came when he thought the church needed a chandelier in the sanctuary to brighten up the place. Accordingly, in his sermon on Sunday he mentioned installing

HE001 028

---

*Talk at Workshop of the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, Durham, North Carolina, January 30, 1969.

the chandelier, and on the following Wednesday he raised the question with his board of deacons. To his surprise, they were obviously stunned by the thought and went into executive session to consider it. When they emerged, they announced that they were unanimously opposed to the whole idea.

The preacher was puzzled. He figured that his usually successful method of getting a new idea across must have gone wrong somewhere. So he waited a month and tried again. He mentioned the chandelier in his sermon on Sunday and presented it again to his deacons on the following Wednesday. Again they were stunned. Again they went into executive session. Again they voted it down unanimously.

More puzzled than ever, the preacher decided to have a private talk with one of his senior deacons to find out the reason for the opposition. So he drove out to the man's farm one day and put the question to him straight.

"Mr. Jones, why is it that the deacons are so set against buying a chandelier for the church?"

"Well, Reverend," said Mr. Jones, "I'll tell you. We figure there are three powerful reasons against it. First, none of us would be able to order a chandelier, because there ain't none of us here knows how to spell it. Second, even if we did get a chandelier there ain't nobody in the congregation as knows how to play it. And third, we don't think we ought to be putting our money in a chandelier when what this church needs most is a new set of lights!"

In the remarks I am about to make there are a number of chandelier concepts, and I want to spend some time spelling them out and playing on them, so that we shall improve the possibility of getting more light on the need for institutional

research during a time when the conflicts between leftists and rightists are producing more and more turbulence on more and more college campuses. Two chandelier concepts that deserve special attention these days are institutional research in higher education and what I call the Left-Right Continuum. After exploring these in some detail, I shall put forward the thesis that the opportunities and possibilities for fruitful institutional research in a period of turbulence are in many ways better than they are when campuses are quiet and everything seems to be running smoothly.

The Dimensions of Institutional Research

So let's look first at the several dimensions of institutional research. Some of you may have read an article I wrote on this subject three years ago.[1] I have reread that article myself and I can find nothing much in it that disturbs me. Tonight, however, I should like to expand the meanings of institutional research somewhat beyond the meanings I put down there. As I see it now, there are two main branches of institutional research in higher education, both of which are necessary if we are ever to understand where we are, where we are going, and how we are most likely to get there. One of these main branches has to do with research involving <u>groups</u> of institutions, and the other has to do with research on a <u>single</u> institution. I shall call the first INTERinstitutional research and the second INTRAinstitutional research. As I understand the situation here, INTRAinstitutional research is the kind that this Regional Education Laboratory expects to be handled in each college by a person you call an Educational Development Officer, or have you by now thought up a new title for him? Be that as it may,

I'll go by the book and call him an EDO in the hope that he is not a chandelier concept, but a bringer of light to the operations of his own local institution. This should be his main job, of course, but I think that if an EDO is to do the local job properly he must have a strong secondary interest in what's happening in INTERinstitutional research and, indeed, that he should be devoting some part of his time in cooperative enterprises to further it. So let's think for a moment about INTERinstitutional research, i.e., research involving groups of colleges.

Interinstitutional research, like any institutional research, takes many forms. One excellent example of it is the planning study for higher education in North Carolina that Howard Boozer and his colleagues produced last November.[2] Chapter V of the Boozer Report is especially relevant to tonight's discussion. I hope everyone here has read it. Other quite different and diversified types of interinstitutional research are exemplified by Earl McGrath's classic study of the predominantly Negro colleges,[3] Jay Davis's studies of faculty perceptions of students,[4] Richard Peterson's studies of organized student protest,[5] Rodney Hartnett's study of college and university trustees,[6] and Alexander Astin's study of undergraduate achievement and institutional excellence.[7] There are, of course, hundreds of other interinstitutional studies, either published or in the works, that touch on innumerable facets of the enterprise, and it has to be conceded that no institutional researcher, whether he be an EDO or any other kind, can keep abreast of all of them and retain his sanity. Nevertheless, I think it is incumbent upon the EDO to dip into the literature whenever he can, so as

to develop a framework which will give him perspective on his own institution and suggest the kind of questions his own research should be asking of it. It is of course also incumbent on the college authorities to give the EDO enough time and encouragement to do this sort of thing. Otherwise, he is likely to fall into the trap of the old Talmudic scholar who went about button-holing his fellow scholars with the plea: "Look! I have worked out a beautiful answer. Will someone please find me a good question to go with it?"

One great value of interinstitutional research is that it can raise a host of questions which bear on the operations of individual institutions, but for which they must, in the last analysis, find their own answers through studies of their own operations on their own campuses. Another great value of interinstitutional research is that it brings to light many institutional variables that are simply not visible when one looks at a single institution. For instance, it is virtually impossible to know how much difference the level of faculty salaries is likely to make in the quality of a faculty until one knows something about the range of salaries and the range of faculty quality over many institutions. Similarly, it is not possible to know very much about the environmental climate in one's own college (as measured for instance by CUES)[8] until one has been able to compare it with the climate in other colleges. In short, interinstitutional research is a source of comparative data on college functioning which can be obtained in no other way and which is indispensable not only for making informed decisions about higher education at the state and federal level but also for supplying an important part of the information base for decisions at individual colleges.

But interinstitutional research is far from sufficient as a means for ensuring the health of a particular institution. It must be strongly supplemented --

far more than it has been up to now -- by what I am calling INTRAinstitutional research. As I see it, there are three levels of intrainstitutional research that must go hand in hand if a college is to be properly served.

The first level is what one might call ear-to-the-ground research, and I suspect that it is the kind of intrainstitutional research that is most seriously lacking. By "ear-to-the-ground research" I mean that which provides a continuous flow of readily interpretable information about the subsurface phenomena of a college or university. As I read the Cox Commission report on the crisis at Columbia,[9] it was the absence of such information that was in large measure responsible for the explosions that occurred there last spring. There were problems in student and faculty morale and community attitudes that had been building up for a number of years and were not being attended to, primarily, I think, because nobody was specifically responsible for regularly and systematically accumulating information on such matters and organizing it in a manner to command attention and stimulate corrective action. Pieces of information were available about such matters as dormitory conditons and the slippage in faculty salaries, but not until after the event were these pieces brought together in a way to suggest how extensive the loss of morale had become. One of the instructive features of the Cox Commission report is its showing that, although the extremist group was only a small fraction of the total student body, its radical actions were nevertheless capable of triggering a response in a very considerable number of students that brought to light a degree of student unrest beyond anything that hitherto had been suspected. At the same time these same actions

illuminated attitudes on the part of the faculty and administrative authorities which had also not been suspected, even by themselves. The comment of the Cox report on this phenomenon is worth keeping in mind:

> One of the causes of the April disturbances was the organized effort of a tiny group of students, within the SDS, whose object was to subvert and destroy the university as a corrupt pillar of an evil society. We cannot estimate the number of hard core revolutionists but we are convinced that it was tiny. Doubtless, there were many more, attracted to SDS for sundry idealistic reasons, who talked -- and in April 1968 lived -- revolution, half-seriously and half in a dream world. Unfortunately, the failure of both the Administration and much of the faculty...to distinguish the former group from the great body of students genuinely concerned with improving the University not only left the University philosophically and tactically unprepared for the crisis, but also prolonged its duration.[10]

It seems to me that the failure to make such distinctions can be put down to a failure in what I'm calling ear-to-the-ground research. It should not require a major earthquake to disclose the faults in the substructure of an educational institution.

Let me make two more points about ear-to-the-ground research: one has to do with its scope and the other with its instrumentation. By calling attention to the Cox Commission report, I do not mean to give the impression that ear-to-the-ground research should be limited <u>only</u> to identifying problems in student and faculty morale and the sources of unrest. There are dozens of other aspects of institutional functioning to which it should be giving continual attention: for example, the efficiency of instruction, faculty grading practices, community relations, alumni concerns, the cost and quality of food services, the quality and quantity of student counseling, faculty involvement in public

service activities -- in short, all the things that characterize the on-going day-to-day operations of an institution -- all the things that, because of the innumerable conflicting pressures and demands from without and within, can get out of adjustment and prevent the college from being the positive force that it can be.

It might be objected that what I am calling ear-to-the-ground research, if energetically carried on, could have the effect of stifling the free functioning of the college by invading the privacy of its constituents. It suggests the intolerable image of Big Brother keeping a minute watch on everyone on the campus to make sure that nobody gets out line. I think this is a real danger that has to be guarded against if the institution is to remain educationally effective and viable. On the other hand, I am equally convinced that an institution runs just as great a danger of falling apart or becoming moribund if those who <u>are</u> the institution -- students, faculty, and administration alike -- are in the dark or suffering from illusions about what is actually going on.

How does one resolve this dilemma? I think the first step in resolving it is for the institutional researcher to recognize that it exists and to sharpen his professional conscience to the point where he is sufficiently sensitive to distinguish the kinds of probes for information that are socially and educationally acceptable from the kinds that violate the privacy

of individuals. This does not mean ruling out all polls and questionnaires; it means being careful about their content, the manner in which they are conducted, and the manner in which the data are handled and interpreted.

Another possibly more effective way around the dilemma is to make maximum use of what have come to be called "unobtrusive measures." I suppose many of you are familiar with the monograph by Eugene Webb and others on the theory and use of such measures.[11] They are based on the sorts of institutional data that are generally available without asking anybody to answer questions about themselves or anybody else. If you want to get an idea of the degree to which the ideas of Herbert Marcuse are affecting student thought, you observe how often his books are being borrowed or stolen from the library and how beat up they are when they come back. Bulletin boards and student publications can also be a rich source of data about what is on the minds of students.

And then there are the ordinary data lying in the registrar's files, which, if properly organized, can be made to yield useful information. In that pre-historic era when I personally was involved with intrainstitutional research of a sort -- and that was before the term institutional research was invented and student unrest usually took the form of panty raids -- we used to make, for instance, an annual study of instructors' grading habits in order to identify those who were unconscionably tough markers and those who were too kind to be just. We did this through the simple device of comparing the average grades an

instructor gave his students in any course with the average of the grades made by the same students in all their other courses. The difference between the two averages we called the course index. These indices were kept in a locked file in my office, and any instructor was permitted to see his own index but not that of any other instructor. Thus the measure was both unobtrusive and confidential. It had a useful corrective effect on grading practices -- especially those of new-fledged instructors.

A second level of intrainstitutional research is one that I shall call single-shot-special problems research (SSSP). This is the type of research that focuses on some particular social, educational, or administrative problem that has aroused the interest or worry of some person or persons in the academic community -- deans, department heads, professors, students -- collects special data on the situation, analyzes them, and comes up with some more or less firm inferences about them that may result in some sort of action. There is an abundance of single-shot-special problem research inside and outside the literature on higher education. It flows not only from offices of institutional research, but from departments of psychology and sociology as well, and it is often embodied in Ph.D. dissertations. The recent monograph by Newcomb and Feldman on the impacts of colleges on their students cites among others no fewer than 180 SSSP studies from all over the country,[12] even though the monograph was focussing on only one relatively limited aspect of the American college enterprise: its effects on student values and attitudes.

Going back again to my own prehistoric era, I shall mention examples of two completely different types of SSSP studies that Newcomb and Feldman do not cite because they were never published and because they would no longer be of interest if they had been. One study dealt with an administrative problem. It was occasioned by the apparent necessity to raise tuition, and the Committee on Educational Policy wanted to know what kinds of strain such an action would produce in what kinds of students and what effects it might have, over time, in changing the character of the student body. One aspect of this study that I found particularly gratifying is that it was a truly joint effort in which I had the expert help of a full professor of sociology and a full professor of economics.

The other example from my remote past was a completely different type of study. It was an experimental study directed at an instructional problem of long standing. It also was initiated by the Committee on Educational Policy. It sought to determine whether the standard course in freshman composition, which had been in existence for at least 30 years, should be abolished and replaced by a different course. The proponents of the new course claimed that it would accomplish the same purpose better than the old course in half the time at about one-quarter of the expense. The reason I remember this SSSP study so warmly is that it was the one time in my life when I was given carte blanche to run a study in accordance with a really rigorous experimental design. For instance, I was permitted to assign all the new freshmen to the two treatments strictly on a random basis. The measures we used to determine the experimental effects were carefully worked out in advance in a joint conference made up of

the head of the old course, the head of the new course, and me. The manner in which the results were analyzed was my sole responsibility. The results were interesting. We found no difference in learning effects between the two courses, which was of course a plus for the new course. Another outcome of the experiment, however, shook up the faculty no-end: the results showed that in neither course did the students register any significant gain in writing ability. I think it would be salutary if studies like this could be repeated everywhere, especially now when the clamor for instructional innovation from all quarters seems to be attended more by noise than by thought.

The third level of intrainstitutional research is that which has as its purpose the characterization of the institution as a total dynamic entity. This research stands at the top of a kind of hierarchy which includes both ear-to-the-ground research and single-shot-special problems research. It incorporates in it the pertinent data from all such efforts, but it goes further and tries to identify and interrelate all the variables that determine what the institution is and can become. It has been called institutional self-study, and its purpose is to provide trend data for long-term planning. We might therefore label it long-term-planning research. It is not the sort of thing that can be done, or ought to be done, every year or every other year, but probably every five years or so.

We have still a good deal to learn about long-term-planning research, and this is not the place or time to sketch out all that it might be. But I should like to make a few cautionary remarks about it.

I think Educational Development Officers, backed up by their presidents, need to be wary lest long-term-planning research be captured by the systems analysts. And by systems analysts I mean economists, operations analysts, systems engineers, and other assorted types who have just recently discovered educational institutions as a rich field for testing theories and marketing hardware. These are the types that are engrossed with the development of mathematical models of educational systems, cost/effectiveness analysis, cost/benefit analysis, computer simulations of institutional operations, and studies of educational productivity by some form of input-output analysis that is supposed to yield numbers that reflect what the economists call "value-added." The great goal of the systems analysts is to provide the educational administrator with a planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS) that will enable him to make decisions with a minimum of guess-work about what the consequences of any of his decisions will be.

Let me be crystal clear about the so-called "systems approach" to the management of colleges and universities. I am all for it. I think the goal is entirely laudable. I think that the efforts of systems analysts in conceptualizing the extraordinarily complex functions of educational institutions are altogether in the right direction.[13] But I am also convinced that the goal has not yet been reached and that the efforts to reach it are, at the present time, seriously uninformed about the nature of the variables that are operative in educational systems. For instance, what in the world is meant by that lovely chandelier word "educational productivity?" Some of the systems models are

beautiful to behold. But we are still far from identifying or being able to measure some of the most important variables to plug into the models. The identification and measurement of such variables ought to be the prime job of the local institutional researcher who is in position to know his own campus better than any systems theorist can possibly know it. And until he has reached the point where he has these variables reasonably well in hand, it seems to me that any practical application of systems theory in the formulation of educational policy can be not only an exercise in futility, but possibly also a generator of more wrong decisions than right ones.

In short, it seems to me that the local institutional researcher -- The Educational Development Officer, if you will -- ought to be keeping up to date in the development of systems analysis and, where possible, helping to speed the day when it will make a major contribution to long-term planning. In the meantime, the emphasis in systems analysis needs to be on <u>research</u> toward making the analysis workable and relevant and understandable rather than on its instant application to decision making and planning. And this suggests that the EDO and his confederates in the administration should take care not to become befuddled by the often over-enthusiastic rhetoric of some systems analysts who often seem not to know much if anything about the educational realities of educational institutions.

So ends my discussion of the two main branches of institutional research -- INTERinstitutional research and INTRAinstitutional research -- and of the twigs on the intrainstitutional branch: ear-to-the-ground research, single-shot-special

problems research, and long-term-planning research. I realize that I have been sketching a map of institutional research so immense that its demands are far beyond the time and energy that any one Educational Development Officer, working at it part time, can hope to muster. And if, about now, I were standing in the shoes of such an EDO, I would probably feel as breathless as the father of the little boy who was practicing on a skate-board.

He was extraordinarily clever with the skate-board. I saw him slaloming down sidewalks on one leg, on one hand, and even on his head. And then he managed a most remarkable maneuver. By some manipulation of the laws of gravity, he began riding the skate-board uphill as well as down.

I asked him how in the world that uphill glide was possible. He turned the board over and showed me. Underneath, attached to the skates on the front part of the board, was a small but powerful motor.

"Where did you get such a nice little motor?" I said.

"Out of my father's iron lung," he said.

"And what did your father say?"

"Arrgh!"

The Right-Left Continuum

Which brings us, more or less appropriately, to another chandelier concept: what I am calling the Right-Left Continuum. One of my colleagues at ETS, Richard Peterson, recently spoke at the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges on the subject, "Reform in Higher Education -- Goals of the Right and Left."[14] Based on his studies of student unrest,[15] Peterson has come

up with an interesting set of typologies that help to define some broad segments of the Right-Left Continuum. He describes four of them that he labels the Anarchist Left, the Reformist Left, the Nostalgic Right, and the Upright Right. The Anarchist Left consists mainly of the SDSers, the hippies, and the Yippies, all of whom are in revolt against most present forms of authority in the colleges and universities, as well as in society generally, and many of whom espouse what they call "participatory democracy." He characterizes them not as the bomb-throwing type of anarchist, but primarily as individuals who want to be left alone to live their own lives as they see fit. He thinks they make up about five per cent of the student body nationally.

The Reformist Left, he says, are those who would be satisfied with piecemeal changes in higher education. This group includes not only students, but also some faculty members, a few -- very few -- college presidents, a handful of trustees, and a number of the foundations. In other words, the Reformist Left is a mixed bag with a mixed collection of people, goals, and tactics. The student contingent, for instance, includes students in both the National Student Association and the Black Student Union. The faculty contingent consists of the more vocal members of the AAUP and probably all who belong to the AFT.

The Nostalgic Right, according to Peterson, is made up mostly of faculty members who either want to keep things the way they are now or who want to go back to the good old days when the college was a kind of cloister where the contemplative life could be carried on undisturbed by the excursions and alarums of the modern world. A recent book, The American University by Jacques Barzun,[16]

exemplifies this posture, Peterson thinks, and so also does George Kennan's book, Democracy and the Student Left.[17] A good many old grads, who want their college to stay the way they remember it, also help to swell the ranks of the Nostalgic Right.

And finally, at the extreme right of the continuum is the Upright Right. These are mostly people outside the campus -- politicians, newspaper editors, quite a few trustees, and certain parents. These people are those who, to quote Peterson, are

> frightened by every new idea and event on the socio-cultural scene, believing that the values they know to be right are being corrupted. More so than most other people, their minds are closed, paralyzed; they are indisposed to even considering the validity of alternative beliefs and behaviors. In short, the upright right is also uptight.

I have given this much attention to Peterson's description of the elements in the right-left continuum because I think it provides a useful beginning -- but only a beginning -- for the development of a kind of socio-cultural yardstick that any individual college concerned with self-understanding might usefully apply to itself, if only in an informal way. But there are three points about this socio-cultural yardstick that need to be kept in mind in any attempt to use it locally.

First, as you may have noticed, it has a big gap right in the middle between the Reformist Left and the Nostalgic Right. This gap, which is recognized by Peterson, contains the great majority of students who are uninterested in campus politics or, possibly, any kind of politics. It also contains those members of the faculty who generally go along with the changes taking place in the college

and adapt to them without raising a fuss. Borrowing loosely a term from classical logic, I shall call these people the Undistributed Middle in the Right-Left Continuum. They are the people we take too much for granted. They are "undistributed" in the sense that, if we paid more attention than we do to their needs, wants, feelings, hopes, interest, abilities, and unnoticed behavior, they would in fact distribute themselves into many different human categories to which any institution that calls itself educational ought to be sensitive if it hopes to fulfill its primary social mission.

I suspect that among those who are too often lost from sight in the Undistributed Middle are the local institutional researchers themselves who go about gathering data and writing reports that few people bother to read. And this is most unfortunate because one of the important functions of the local institutional researcher, as I see him, is precisely to be the interpreter of the Undistributed Middle as well as of the more visible groups -- to remind his colleagues that there are real persons in that seemingly undifferentiated tuition-paying mass each with his own peculiar aspirations, frustrations, and possibilities that need attending to and that, if not attended to, can become the seeds for future academic explosions beyond anything we have seen thus far.

The second point I want to make about the socio-cultural yardstick running from the Anarchist Left to the Upright Right is that it is, if you will, a multidimensional yardstick. This is to say that the Right-Left Continuum is not to be thought of as a scale for assessing a single attribute of the college community, but a complex of scales that encompass many different kinds of

attributes. There are many different kinds of Leftism and Rightism, just as there are many different kinds of honesty or dishonesty, many different kinds of human talent, and many different kinds of institutional purpose. Peterson's paper brings out this multidimensionality of the continuum very well, but it is a matter that needs to be explored in greater depth if we are to cope with it adequately. I think much of our trouble in the management of higher education, and education generally, is that we are all too prone to one-dimensional thinking; we tend to focus on one aspect of our institutional problem and tend to forget that it is not the whole problem. It seems to me that one of the tasks of the institutional researcher is to help the people in his academic community overcome this tendency.

Finally, it is worth remembering that what I am calling the socio-cultural, multidimensional yardstick -- the Right-Left Continuum for short -- is something that has grown out of INTERinstitutional research. It enables us to make some tentative and useful statements about higher education in the nation as a whole, but it tells little about the socio-cultural conditions, the sources of dissatisfaction and possible conflict, at any particular institution. It suggests questions, but it does not furnish answers for College A or College B. Finding the particular answers is a functionof INTRAinstitutional research. Which is to say that each college must discover for itself where it lies in the Right-Left Continuum by application of such instruments as CUES,[18] the CSQ,[19] and the Institutional Functioning Inventory,[20] with which I assume you are all familiar. The implication is of course that this effort to describe his own college in this

many-sided continuum is still another job to be saddled on the already impossibly over-burdened local institutional researcher.

If, at this point, I have seemed to be building up to what may seem like an impossible ideal for INTRAinstitutional research, that of course is precisely what I have intended to do. For I firmly believe that unless we can somehow convert the impossible to the possible in this regard, institutions of higher education are going to be in for a very bad time in the years ahead.

The Uses of Turbulence

In that far off time when I began this speech (and it was reasonable to assume that you all were fully awake) I said that I would put forward the thesis that the opportunities and possibilities for fruitful institutional research in a period of turbulence are in many ways better than they are when campuses are quiet and everything seems to be running smoothly. I shall now try to defend this thesis and, hopefully, wind up this talk on a suitably controversial note.

When my assistant learned that I would be sticking my neck out so far as to claim that a time of campus turbulence was the best time for institutional research, she expressed fear that the idea might be badly misconstrued. It might be thought to mean, she said, that when the activists of the far left took over and started smashing everything on the campus, and when the ivied walls began tumbling down, local institutional researchers would then have the new and rare opportunity of counting the bricks!

This, I hasten to assure you, was <u>not</u> exactly what I had in mind. The kind of turbulence I am talking about includes a good deal of irrational behavior on the part of all parties concerned -- students, faculty, administration, trustees, etc. -- but it does not include behavior that destroys the institution, for it seems fairly obvious to me that you cannot carry on institutional research when there is no institution to research. I shall make only two points about the function of the researcher in times of turbulence.

My first point rests on three propositions: (1) that most people are irrational most of the time (2) that in a time of conflict their irrationalities come to the surface and can be more readily examined and (3) that an institutional researcher who has been accustomed to keeping his ear to the ground should be in the best position to examine these irrationalities and extract meaning from them.

Those of you who were at this conference last June heard some excellent papers discussing the virtues and faults of various models of the university: the corporate model, the political model, the legal model, the partnership model.[21] I should like to suggest, somewhat fancifully, a completely different kind of model which might be useful to an instiutional researcher in a time of campus turmoil: namely, a psychoanalytical model, going back to Freud.

As you know, the main elements in the Freudian model of the human personality are the ego, the id, and the superego. The id is down there in the unconscious full of desire for anything at all, however illicit, that will give pleasure and avoid pain. The ego is upstairs generally unaware of what is going on in the

id and unconsciously repressing those animal drives that tend to bubble up and threaten the integrity of the individual. The superego is the conscience that makes the ego feel full of guilt for the desires that are burbling around in the id. The psychological struggle that goes on in this three-way contest makes for much behavior that is irrational. And when the struggle becomes particularly severe a person is said to have a serious neurosis. In order to understand the neurosis and find a cure for it, the psychoanalyst tries to find out what is going on in the id and what unconscious repressions make the individual's behavior so bizarre, maladaptive, and irrelevant.

This of course is a vast oversimplification of Freudian theory. Nevertheless, I think it provides a useful way of thinking about institutions as well as individuals. That is, a college can be said to have an ego, an id, and a superego. Much of the id resides in the Undistributed Middle I have described above, the ego is some combination of the faculty and the administration which tries to keep things on an even keel, and the superego is in the charter of the founding fathers and makes the whole institution feel guilty about not doing what those long-dead fathers expected of it. In short, a college or university is in a constant state of neurosis, and this accounts for its customary irrational behavior.

In ordinary times the irrational behavior goes unnoticed. There are plenty of grumblings in the id, but they are successfully repressed by the ego, and the whole operation proceeds as though everything were sweetness and light. Then something happens -- a student gets fired for cheating, an instructor loses his

temper, recruiters come on the campus (you name it), and the id comes to the surface; its hitherto unconscious and unobserved desires for illicit pleasure and the avoidance of pain become painfully apparent. This is then a time when the institutional researcher, provided he is not himself caught up in the institutional neurosis, can get the best view of the real internal dynamics of the college and suggest the kind of therapy that will bring it into a healthy adjustment with itself and the world outside.

So much for the Freudian analogy. It is pretty wild and should not be pushed too far. I merely drop it into the collective unconscious of institutional research with a view to stirring up the creative processes that are thought to reside there. And now let's look briefly and finally at a less mystical kind of opportunity that comes to institutional researchers in a period of turbulence.

Turbulence speeds up institutional change: changes in rules and regulations, changes in administrative arrangments, changes in the curriculum, changes in overall policies. The setting up of departments for Black Studies is one example. The involvement of students in curriculum planning is another. Increasing participation of both faculty and students in administrative decisions is a third. And one could name a multitude of other changes that have been taking place in the short time that has elapsed since the 1964 uprising at Berkeley.[22] One looks in vain, however, for any concerted plans at any institutions for studies aimed at a careful evaluation of the <u>effects</u> of all these changes on such matters as student learning and attitudes, on faculty morale, on the quality of administrative decisions, and the like. To what extent, for instance, will the provision

of Black Studies really have an effect on improving the self-image of black students? To what extent will student participation in curriculum planning really make the curriculum more relevant or improve the planning ability of students? There are arguments pro and con on all such questions, but as far as I can discover, nobody is seriously taking advantage of these changes to collect any hard data to answer the kinds of questions that are being raised.

It seems to me that if any college or university is to fulfill its true destiny as an educational institution, it must find some way of monitoring and evaluating the changes that inevitably occur within it, especially during turbulent times. And that, as I understand it, is what institutional research is all about.

NOTES

1. Henry S. Dyer. Can institutional research lead to a science of institutions? The Educational Record, 47:452-466 (1966).

2. Howard Boozer. Planning for Higher Education in North Carolina. Raleigh, N. C., November 1968.

3. Earl J. McGrath. The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

4. Junius A. Davis. Faculty Perceptions of Students. Research and Development Reports, RDR-63-4, Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1964 and 1965.

5. Richard E. Peterson. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965, and The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-1968. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966 and 1968.

6. Rodney T. Hartnett. College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

7. Alexander W. Astin. Undergraduate achievement and institutional "excellence." Science, 161:661-668, (1968).

8. C. Robert Pace. College and University Environment Scales. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

9. Fact-finding Commission on Columbia Disturbances. Crisis at Columbia. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1968.

10. Ibid. pp. 58-59.

11. Eugene J. Webb, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, Lee Sechrest. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

12. Theodore M. Newcomb and Kenneth A. Feldman. The Impacts of Colleges Upon Their Students. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, January, 1968 (mimeo) pp. 527-565.

13. For a balanced account of the systems approach and its problems, see C. West Churchman. The Systems Approach. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

14. Richard E. Peterson. Reform in higher education -- goals of the right and left. Speech prepared for the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges, January 14-15, 1969, Pittsburgh, Pa.

15. See note 5 above.

16. Jacques Barzun. The American University: How It Runs, Where It is Going. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

17. George F. Kennan. Democracy and the Student Left. Boston: Little, Brown, 1968.

18. See note 8 above.

19. Educational Testing Service. The College Student Questionnaires, Parts I and II. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

20. Educational Testing Service. The Institutional Functioning Inventory. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

21. Julian Foster. The University: Corporation or Political System. William VanAlstyne. The Emerging Role of Students in Academic Life. William C. Craig. Two Critical Partnerships to Build: Federal and Student. In RELCV, Proceedings, Conference on Research-Based Planning and Development. Durham: RELCV, June 1968. pp. 24-55.

22. For a brief account of some of these changes, see Nathan Glazer. Student power in Berkeley. The Public Interest. Fall, 1968, pp. 3-21; also John H. Bunzel. Black studies at San Francisco State. Same issue, pp. 22-38.